

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed September 9, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-13 and 15-20 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 15 and 18-20 have been amended. As a result, claims 1-13 and 15-20 are pending for examination with claims 1, 7 and 8 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-13 and 15-20. The Examiner indicated that claims 1-13 and 15-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claims 2, 13 and 18-20 as including terms lacking proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 2, 13 and 18-20 to address the Examiner's concerns.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 to delete an inadvertent term "to" at the end of each of the claims. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 8 as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 15 has been amended to correct an antecedent basis issue. In addition, the Office Action indicates that, in claim 15, there is an insufficient antecedent basis for "the predetermined number of the coding block output terminals." Applicant respectfully notes that claim 15 recites the integrated circuit of claim 7, wherein each output terminal is connected to an input terminal of a coding block comprising *a predetermined number of coding block output terminals*, each of *the coding block output terminals* is connected to a test terminal ... (emphasis added). Further,

claim 15 states that the predetermined number of the coding block output terminals switch states one at a time. Thus, there is an antecedent basis for “the predetermined number of the coding block output terminals” in claim 15.

Finally, claim 19 has been amended to recite “simultaneously” instead of “substantially simultaneously.”

Thus, Applicant has addressed all of the issues pointed in the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-20 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825 under Docket No. S1022.81223US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James H. Morris

Registration No.: 34,681

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000